arXiv:1510.08054v1 [math.NT] 27 Oct 2015

LIMIT POINTS AND LONG GAPS BETWEEN PRIMES

ROGER BAKER AND TRISTAN FREIBERG

ABSTRACT. Let $d_n := p_{n+1} - p_n$, where p_n denotes the nth smallest prime, and let $R(T) := \log T \log_2 T \log_4 T/(\log_3 T)^2$ (the "Erdős–Rankin" function). We consider the sequence $(d_n/R(p_n))$ of normalized prime gaps, and show that its limit point set contains at least 25% of nonnegative real numbers. We also show that the same result holds if $R(T)$ is replaced by any "reasonable" function that tends to infinity more slowly than $R(T)\log_3 T$. We also consider "chains" of normalized prime gaps. Our proof combines breakthrough work of Maynard and Tao on bounded gaps between primes with subsequent developments of Ford, Green, Konyagin, Maynard and Tao on long gaps between consecutive primes.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $d_n := p_{n+1} - p_n$, where p_n denotes the nth smallest prime. One variant of the prime number theorem states that

$$\frac{1}{x}\sum_{n\leqslant x}\frac{d_n}{\log p_n} \sim 1 \quad (x\to\infty),$$

that is, $d_n/\log p_n$ is approximately 1 on average over $n \leqslant x$. As to the finer questions pertaining to the distribution of primes, we have little more than conjecture in the way of answers. Heuristics based on Cramér's model[1] suggest that for any given real numbers $b > a \geqslant 0$,

$$\frac{1}{x}\#\big\{n\leqslant x : a < d_n/\log p_n \leqslant b\big\} \sim \int_a^b \mathrm{e}^{-t}\,\mathrm{d}t \quad (x\to\infty).$$

However, we do not even know of any specific limit point of the sequence $(d_n/\log p_n)$, except for 0 and ∞, the former having been known for just a decade, thanks to the groundbreaking work of Goldston–Pintz–Yıldırım [**6**]. (The latter follows from a 1931 result of Westzynthius [**13**].)

This limit point lacuna notwithstanding, Hildebrand and Maier [**7**] showed in 1988 that a positive (but unspecified) proportion of nonnegative real numbers are limit points of $(d_n/\log p_n)$. More recently, the second author, Banks and Maynard [**1**] have shown that in fact at least 12.5% of nonnegative real numbers are limit points of $(d_n/\log p_n)$. The proof strategy in [**1**] incorporates an "Erdős–Rankin" type construction for producing long gaps between consecutive primes into the celebrated Maynard–Tao sieve, which was originally developed to produce short gaps between primes. More recently still, Ford,

Date: October 29, 2015.

[1]For details, we highly recommend the insightful expository article [**12**] of Soundararajan.

Green, Konyagin, and Tao [**3**], and (independently) Maynard [**9**], have settled the notorious "Erdős–Rankin problem" by showing that ∞ is a limit point of $(d_n/R(p_n))$, where[2] $R(T) := \log T \log_2 T \log_4 T/(\log_3 T)^2$.

We are therefore motivated to study limit points of $(d_n/R(p_n))$. Using basically the same strategy as in [**1**], and the work of Ford, Green, Konyagin, and Tao [**3**], Pintz [**10**, **11**] has shown that at least 25% of nonnegative real numbers are limit points of $(d_n/R(p_n))$. In fact, Pintz's result is that the same statement holds if the normalizing function $R(T)$ is replaced by any function — subject to certain technical conditions — that tends to infinity no faster than $R(T)$, for example $\log T \log_2 T/(\log_3 T)^2$.

Ford, Green, Konyagin, Maynard and Tao [**4**] have actually shown that, for infinitely many n, $d_n \gg R(p_n)\log_3 p_n$. The purpose of this paper is to fully integrate the work of the five-author paper [**4**] into the study of limit points of normalized prime gaps initiated in [**1**, **10**, **11**]. In so doing, we extend the aforementioned result of Pintz in three ways.

First, we show that the normalizing function $R(T)$ may be replaced by any "reasonable" function that tends to infinity more slowly than $R(T)\log_3 T$, for example $R_1(T) = \log T \log_2 T/\log_3 T$. Second, we show that the 25% may conditionally be improved to $33\frac{1}{3}\%$ or even 50% on a certain conjecture concerning the level of distribution of the primes. Third, we also consider "chains" of normalized, consecutive gaps between primes (cf. Theorem 6.4).

Precisely what we mean by a "reasonable" function is best explained in context, so we defer the statement of our main result to §6 (cf. Theorem 6.2). Examples of "reasonable" functions are $\log_6 T$, $\sqrt{\log T}$, $\log_2 T/\sqrt{\log_3 T}$, $(\log T)^{7/9}$, $\log T$, $R(T)$, $R_1(T)$ and $R_1(T)\log_5 T$. Any one of these could replace $R_1(T)$ in the following special case of Theorem 6.2, which will serve as a placeholder.

THEOREM 1.1. *Let $d_n := p_{n+1} - p_n$, where p_n denotes the nth smallest prime, and let $\boldsymbol{L}_{R_1}$ denote the set of limit points in $[0,\infty]$ of the sequence $(d_n/R_1(p_n))_{p_n \geqslant T_0}$, where*

$$R_1(T) := \log T \log_2 T/\log_3 T$$

and T_0 is large enough so that $\log_3 T_0 \geqslant 1$. Given any five nonnegative real numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_5$ with $\alpha_1 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \alpha_5$, we have $\{\alpha_j - \alpha_i : 1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant 5\} \cap \boldsymbol{L}_{R_1} \neq \varnothing$.

As in [**1**, Corollary 1.2], one may deduce from Theorem 1.1 that, with λ denoting the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$,

$$\lambda([0,X] \cap \boldsymbol{L}_{R_1}) \geqslant X/(4(1+1/2+1/3+1/4)) \quad (X \geqslant 0), \tag{1.1}$$

and[3] (with an ineffective $o(1)$),

$$\lambda([0,X] \cap \boldsymbol{L}_{R_1}) \geqslant (1-o(1))X/4 \quad (X \to \infty). \tag{1.2}$$

As we will see, assuming a certain variant of the Elliott–Halberstam conjecture (cf. Hypothesis 5.3 below), one has $\{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1, \alpha_3 - \alpha_1, \alpha_3 - \alpha_2\} \cap \boldsymbol{L}_{R_1} \neq \varnothing$

[2]We define $\log_2 T := \log\log T$, $\log_3 T := \log\log\log T$ and so on.

[3]Here, by $o(1)$ we mean a positive quantity that tends to zero as X tends to infinity.

for any *three* nonnegative real numbers $\alpha_1 \leqslant \alpha_2 \leqslant \alpha_3$, with corresponding improvements to (1.1) and (1.2) (viz. $2 = 3 - 1$ replaces $4 = 5 - 1$).

Acknowledgments. The second author gratefully acknowledges the hospitality of Brigham Young University, where the work on this paper commenced.

2. Notation and terminology

We rely heavily on the paper **[4]** of Ford, Green, Konyagin, Maynard and Tao, and we follow their notation and conventions. We explain these conventions here, among others, for completeness' sake.

— The set of all primes is denoted by $\mathbf{P}$; p, q, s stand for primes; p_n denotes the nth smallest prime.

— For $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define $a\,(b) := \{a + bc : c \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Thus, $a_1 \equiv a_2\,(b)$ if and only if $a_1\,(b) = a_2\,(b)$.

— A finite set $\mathcal{H}$ of integers is *admissible* if and only if $\mathcal{H}$ is not a complete set of residues modulo p, for any prime p.

— We say an integer is *x-smooth* ($x \in \mathbb{R}$) if and only if its prime divisors are all less than or equal to x.

— For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, we define $n + \mathcal{H} := \{n + q : q \in \mathcal{H}\}$.

— For statements S, $\mathbf{1}_S := 1$ if S is true and $\mathbf{1}_S := 0$ if S is false.

— The cardinality of a set $\mathcal{S}$ is denoted by $\#\mathcal{S}$ or $\#(\mathcal{S})$. The indicator function for $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ (with $\mathcal{T}$ clear in context) is denoted $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{S}}$. That is, for $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{S}}(t) := \mathbf{1}_{t \in \mathcal{S}}$.

— We write $\mathbb{P}$ for probability and $\mathbb{E}$ for expectation.

— Boldface symbols such as $\boldsymbol{X}$ or $\boldsymbol{a}$ denote random variables, while nonboldface symbols such as X or a denote their deterministic counterparts. Vector-valued random variables are indicated in arrowed boldface, for instance $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = (\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}_s)_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$ denotes a random tuple of random variables indexed by the set $\mathcal{S}$.

— If $\boldsymbol{X}$ takes at most countably many values, we define the *essential range* of $\boldsymbol{X}$ to be the set of all X such that $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{X} = X) \neq 0$.

— If E is an event of nonzero probability,

$$\mathbb{P}(F \mid E) := \frac{\mathbb{P}(F \wedge E)}{\mathbb{P}(E)}$$

for any event F, and

$$\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{X} \mid E) := \frac{\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{X}\mathbf{1}_E)}{\mathbb{P}(E)}$$

for any absolutely integrable real-valued random variable $\boldsymbol{X}$. If $\boldsymbol{Y}$ is another random variable taking at most countably many values, we define the conditional probability $\mathbb{P}(F \mid \boldsymbol{Y})$ to be the random variable that equals $\mathbb{P}(F \mid \boldsymbol{Y} = Y)$ on the event $\boldsymbol{Y} = Y$ for each Y in the essential range of $\boldsymbol{Y}$, and similarly define the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{X} \mid \boldsymbol{Y})$ to be the random variable that equals $\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{X} \mid \boldsymbol{Y} = Y)$ on the event $\boldsymbol{Y} = Y$.

— Throughout, x denotes a parameter to be thought of as tending to infinity.
— Thus, $o(1)$ signifies a quantity that tends to zero as $x \to \infty$ and $X \sim Y$ denotes that $X = (1 + o(1))Y$.
— Expressions of the form $X = O(Y)$, $X \ll Y$ and $Y \gg X$ all denote that $|X| \leqslant c|Y|$ throughout the domain of X, for some constant $c > 0$.
— The constant c is to be taken as independent of any parameter unless indicated otherwise, as in $X \ll_{\delta,A} Y$ for instance, in which c depends on δ and A.
— We write $X = O_{\leqslant}(Y)$ to denote that one can take $c = 1$.
— We write $X \asymp Y$ to denote that $X \ll Y \ll X$.

3. Proof strategy

Let x be a large number and set $y := cx \log x \log_2 x / \log_3 x$, where $c > 0$ is a certain small constant. Ford, Green, Konyagin, Maynard and Tao [**4**] show that if C is large enough, then there exists a vector $(c_p(p))_{p \leqslant Cx}$ of residue classes for which

$$\big((x, y] \cap \mathbb{Z}\big) \setminus \bigcup_{p \leqslant Cx} c_p(p) = \varnothing.$$

Thus, if $b(W)$ is the residue class modulo $W := \prod_{p \leqslant Cx} p = \mathrm{e}^{(1+o(1))Cx}$ for which $b \equiv -c_p(p)$ for each $p \leqslant Cx$, then for $n \equiv b(W)$ with $n + x > Cx$,

$$\mathbf{P} \cap (n + x, n + y] = \varnothing.$$

We generalize this slightly by proving that if $\mathcal{H}$ is any set of K primes in $(x, y]$ with $K \leqslant \log x$ (say), the residue classes may be chosen so that

$$\big((x, y] \cap \mathbb{Z}\big) \setminus \bigcup_{p \leqslant Cx} c_p(p) = \mathcal{H}$$

and hence

$$\mathbf{P} \cap (n + x, n + y] = \mathbf{P} \cap n + \mathcal{H}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{H}$, being a set of $K \leqslant \log x$ primes greater than $p_K = O(K \log K)$, is admissible.

Now let $M \geqslant 2$ be an integer with $M \mid K$ and let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{H}_M$ be a partition of $\mathcal{H}$ into M subsets of equal size. As was shown in [**1**], with $M = 9$, a smaller choice of y and a minor technical condition on $\mathcal{H}$, the Maynard–Tao sieve method establishes that for large N, there exists $n \in (N, 2N] \cap b(W)$ and a pair $i < j$ for which

$$\#(\mathbf{P} \cap n + \mathcal{H}_i), \#(\mathbf{P} \cap n + \mathcal{H}_j) \geqslant 1,$$

provided K is sufficiently large and $W \leqslant N^{\eta}$ for some small η.

Choosing $j - i$ to be minimal, we obtain a pair of consecutive primes in $n + \mathcal{H}$. We may carefully choose our primes in $\mathcal{H}$ so that the spacings between them grow faster than $x/\log x$ but slower than y.

Actually, for reasons related to level of distribution and "Siegel" zeros, we require that W not be a multiple of a certain putative "exceptional" modulus less than $N^{O(\eta)}$. The largest prime divisor p' of this exceptional modulus, if it

exists, satisfies $p' \gg \log_2 N^\eta \gg \log x$. For this reason, we introduce a set $\mathcal{Z}$ of "unusable" primes, which has the properties of $\{p'\}$. Their effect is negligible.

Pintz [**11**] has very recently given an elegant simplification of part of this argument, which we take advantage of in this paper, and which shows that one can take $M = 5$.

4. A modification of Ford–Green–Konyagin–Maynard–Tao

4.1. **Main results.** Given a large number x we define

$$y := cx\frac{\log x \log_3 x}{\log_2 x}, \tag{4.1}$$

where c is a certain (small) fixed positive constant, and

$$z := x^{\log_3 x/(4\log_2 x)}. \tag{4.2}$$

We then define

$$\mathcal{S} := \{s \text{ prime} : (\log x)^{20} < s \leqslant z\}, \tag{4.3}$$

$$\mathcal{P} := \{p \text{ prime} : x/2 < p \leqslant x\}, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\mathcal{Q} := \{q \text{ prime} : x < q \leqslant y\}. \tag{4.5}$$

For vectors of residue classes $\vec{a} := (a_s(s))_{s\in\mathcal{S}}$ and $\vec{b} := (b_p(p))_{p\in\mathcal{P}}$, we define sifted sets

$$S(\vec{a}) := \mathbb{Z}\setminus\bigcup_{s\in\mathcal{S}} a_s(s) \quad \text{and} \quad S(\vec{b}) := \mathbb{Z}\setminus\bigcup_{p\in\mathcal{P}} b_p(p).$$

We note that in view of the prime number theorem (with suitably strong error term) and (4.1),

$$\#\mathcal{Q} = \frac{y}{\log x}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log_2 x}{\log x}\right)\right). \tag{4.6}$$

Finally, let K be any natural number satisfying

$$K \leqslant \log x. \tag{4.7}$$

By (4.6), we may suppose x is large enough so that $\mathcal{Q}$ contains at least K primes. Since $p_K \ll K\log K$, we may also suppose that $p_K \leqslant x$. We fix any

$$\mathcal{H} := \{q_1, \dots, q_K\} \subseteq \mathcal{Q} \quad \text{with} \quad \#\mathcal{H} = K. \tag{4.8}$$

Note that $\mathcal{H}$, being a set of K primes larger than p_K, is an admissible set.

Theorem 4.1 (Sieving for primes). *For all sufficiently large x, there exist vectors of residue classes $\vec{a} = (a_s(s))_{s\in\mathcal{S}}$ and $\vec{b} = (b_p(p))_{p\in\mathcal{P}}$ such that $\mathcal{H} \subseteq S(\vec{a}) \cap S(\vec{b})$ and*

$$\#(\mathcal{Q} \cap S(\vec{a}) \cap S(\vec{b})) \ll \frac{x}{\log x}, \tag{4.9}$$

where the implied constant is absolute.

The only difference between Theorem 4.1 and [**4**, Theorem 2] is our additional requirement that $\mathcal{H} \subseteq S(\vec{a}) \cap S(\vec{b})$. Unsurprisingly, the proof of Theorem 4.1 follows that of [**4**, Theorem 2] very closely, even verbatim in many

parts. Nevertheless, the details must be checked, and by including them here we are also able to point out the minor differences between the two proofs.

We now introduce a set $\mathcal{Z}$ of "unusable" primes with the property that for any $p' \in \mathcal{Z}$,

$$\sum_{\substack{p \geqslant p' \\ p \in \mathcal{Z}}} \frac{1}{p} \ll \frac{1}{p'} \ll \frac{1}{\log x}. \tag{4.10}$$

Corollary 4.2. *Let C be a sufficiently large but fixed positive constant. For all sufficiently large x, there exists a vector of residue classes $(c_p(p))_{p \leqslant Cx,\, p \notin \mathcal{Z}}$ such that $\mathcal{H} = \big(\mathbb{Z} \cap (x, y]\big) \setminus \bigcup_{p \leqslant Cx,\, p \notin \mathcal{Z}} c_p(p)$.*

We deduce Corollary 4.2 from Theorem 4.1 with the aid of Lemma 5.1 of [**1**], which is as follows.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mathscr{H}, \mathscr{T}$ be sets of integers, $\mathscr{P}$ a set of primes, such that for some $x \geqslant 2$, $\mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathscr{T} \subseteq [0, x^2]$ and $\#\{p \in \mathscr{P} : p > x\} > \#\mathscr{H} + \#\mathscr{T}$. If $\mathscr{H}$ is admissible then there exists a vector of residue classes $(\gamma_p(p))_{p \in \mathscr{P}}$ such that $\mathscr{H} = \mathscr{T} \setminus \bigcup_{p \in \mathscr{P}} \gamma_p(p)$.*

Deduction of Corollary 4.2. We choose x, $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{b}$ so that the conclusions of Theorem 4.1 hold, and work with the enlarged sifted sets

$$S_{\mathcal{Z}}(\vec{a}) := \mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{Z}} a_s(s) \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\mathcal{Z}}(\vec{b}) := \mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{Z}} b_p(p).$$

Note that if $n \in S_{\mathcal{Z}}(\vec{a}) \cap S_{\mathcal{Z}}(\vec{b})$, then either $n \in S(\vec{a}) \cap S(\vec{b})$, $n \equiv a_s(s)$ for some $s \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{Z}$ or $n \equiv b_p(p)$ for some $p \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Z}$. Now,

$$\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{\substack{n \leqslant y \\ n \equiv a_s(s)}} 1 + \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{\substack{n \leqslant y \\ n \equiv b_p(p)}} 1 \leqslant y \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{Z} \\ p > (\log x)^{20}}} \frac{1}{p'} \ll \frac{y}{(\log x)^{20}}$$

by (4.3), (4.4) and (4.10). Thus, the elements of $\mathcal{Q} \cap S_{\mathcal{Z}}(\vec{a}) \cap S_{\mathcal{Z}}(\vec{b})$ that are not in $\mathcal{Q} \cap S(\vec{a}) \cap S(\vec{b})$ number at most $y/(\log x)^{20} \ll x/(\log x)^{19}$ by (4.1). We conclude from (4.9) that

$$\#(\mathcal{Q} \cap S_{\mathcal{Z}}(\vec{a}) \cap S_{\mathcal{Z}}(\vec{b})) \ll \frac{x}{\log x}. \tag{4.11}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{L} := \{\ell \text{ prime} : \ell \in [2, (\log x)^{20}] \cup (z, x/2]\}$$

so that $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{P}$ is a partition of the primes less than or equal to x. We define a vector of residue classes $(c_p(p))_{p \leqslant x,\, p \notin \mathcal{Z}}$ by setting

$$c_p := \begin{cases} a_p & p \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{Z} \\ b_p & p \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{Z} \\ 0 & p \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{Z}. \end{cases}$$

Recalling that Theorem 4.1 gives $\mathcal{H} \subseteq S(\vec{a}) \cap S(\vec{b})$, and noting that $\mathcal{H}$ consists of primes larger than x by definition, we see that

$$\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{T} := \big(\mathbb{Z} \cap (x, y]\big) \setminus \bigcup_{p \leqslant x,\, p \notin \mathcal{Z}} c_p(p).$$

Now, if $n \in \mathcal{T}$ then $x < n \leqslant y$ and either

(1) n is divisible by a prime $p' > x/2$,
(2) n is divisible by a prime $p' \in (z, x/2]$, or
(3) n is z-smooth.

In case (1), $n = mp'$ for some $m \leqslant y/p' < 2y/x = o(\log x)$ by (4.1) and so, by (4.10), m is not divisible by any prime in $\mathcal{Z}$ (provided x is sufficiently large, as we assume). Nor is m divisible by any other prime $p < 2y/x$, since such primes are in $\mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{Z}$ and $c_p = 0$ for such primes. Hence $m = 1$, and n must belong to $\mathcal{Q} \cap S_{\mathcal{Z}}(\vec{a}) \cap S_{\mathcal{Z}}(\vec{b})$. Thus,

$$\#\{n \in \mathcal{T} : \text{(1) holds}\} \leqslant \#(\mathcal{Q} \cap S_{\mathcal{Z}}(\vec{a}) \cap S_{\mathcal{Z}}(\vec{b})) \ll \frac{x}{\log x} \tag{4.12}$$

by (4.11). In case (2), the prime p' must belong to $\mathcal{Z}$, for otherwise $c_{p'} = 0$. Thus,

$$\#\{n \in \mathcal{T} : \text{(2) holds}\} \ll y \sum_{p > z,\, p \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{1}{p} \ll \frac{y}{z} = o\Big(\frac{x}{\log x}\Big) \tag{4.13}$$

by (4.2) and (4.1). As shown in [**4**, Theorem 2 et seq.], smooth number estimates give

$$\#\{n \in \mathcal{T} : \text{(3) holds}\} = o\Big(\frac{x}{\log x}\Big). \tag{4.14}$$

Combining (4.12), (4.13) and (4.14), we obtain $K + \#\mathcal{T} \ll x/\log x$ in view of (4.7). We may therefore choose our constant C to be large enough so that

$$\#\{p \text{ prime} : p \in (x, Cx],\, p \notin \mathcal{Z}\} > K + \#\mathcal{T}.$$

(The number of primes in $\mathcal{Z}$ that belong to $(x, Cx]$ is negligible, for

$$\#\{p \in \mathcal{Z} : p \leqslant Cx\} \ll \log x,$$

as can be seen from (4.10) [write $1 = p/p$ and sum dyadically].) As $\mathcal{H}$ is an admissible subset of $\mathcal{T} \subseteq (x, y]$, we must conclude, in view of Lemma 4.3, that for sufficiently large x there exist residue classes $c_p(p)$ for $p \in (x, Cx]$, $p \notin \mathcal{Z}$, such that

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{T} \setminus \bigcup_{p \in (x, Cx],\, p \notin \mathcal{Z}} c_p(p) = \big(\mathbb{Z} \cap (x, y]\big) \setminus \bigcup_{p \leqslant Cx,\, p \notin \mathcal{Z}} c_p(p).$$

□

In order to prove Theorem 4.1 we must first establish the following result, which is analogous to [**4**, Theorem 4].

Theorem 4.4 (Random construction). *Let x be sufficiently large. There exists a positive number C with*

$$C \asymp \frac{1}{c}, \tag{4.15}$$

the implied constants being independent of c, a set of positive integers $\{h_1, \dots, h_r\}$ with $r \leqslant \sqrt{\log x}$, and random vectors $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = (\boldsymbol{a}_s(s))_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$ and $\vec{\boldsymbol{n}} = (\boldsymbol{n}_p)_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ of residue classes $\boldsymbol{a}_s(s)$ and integers $\boldsymbol{n}_p$ respectively, satisfying the following.

(*i*) *For every* $\vec{a} = (a_s(s))_{s\in\mathcal{S}}$ *in the essential range of* $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}$*, we have*

$$\mathcal{H} \cap a_s(s) = \varnothing \quad (s \in \mathcal{S}).$$

(*ii*) *For every* $\vec{n} = (n_p(p))_{p\in\mathcal{P}}$ *in the essential range of* $\vec{\boldsymbol{n}}$*, we have*

$$\mathcal{H} \cap n_p(p) = \varnothing \quad (p \in \mathcal{P}).$$

(*iii*) *For every* $\vec{a}$ *in the essential range of* $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}$*, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(q \in \boldsymbol{e}_p(\vec{a}) \mid \vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}) \leqslant x^{-3/5} \quad (p \in \mathcal{P}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{e}_p(\vec{a}) := \{\boldsymbol{n}_p + h_i p : i \leqslant r\} \cap \mathcal{Q} \cap S(\vec{a})$.

(*iv*) *With probability* $1 - o(1)$*, we have*

$$\#(\mathcal{Q} \cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})) \sim 80cx\frac{\log_2 x}{\log x}. \tag{4.16}$$

(*v*) *Call an element* $\vec{a}$ *in the essential range of* $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}$ *"good" if, for all but at most* $\frac{x}{\log x \log_2 x}$ *elements* $q \in \mathcal{Q} \cap S(\vec{a})$*, one has*

$$\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}(q \in \boldsymbol{e}_p(\vec{a}) \mid \vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}) = C + O_{\leqslant}\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^2}\bigg). \tag{4.17}$$

Then $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}$ *is good with probability* $1 - o(1)$.

4.2. **Proof of Theorem 4.4.** Let $x, c, y, z, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}, K$ and $\mathcal{H}$ be as in Theorem 4.4. We set

$$r := \lfloor (\log x)^{1/5} \rfloor \tag{4.18}$$

and let $\{h_1, \dots, h_r\}$ be the admissible set with $h_i := (2i-1)^2$ for $i \leqslant r$. Our first lemma is a special case of [**4**, Theorem 5].

Lemma 4.5 (Existence of a good sieve weight). *There exist positive quantities*

$$\tau \geqslant x^{o(1)} \quad \textit{and} \quad u \asymp \log_2 x, \tag{4.19}$$

and a function $w : \mathcal{P} \times \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *supported on* $\mathcal{P} \times [-y, y]$*, satisfying the following.*

(*i*) *Uniformly for* $p \in \mathcal{P}$*,*

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} w(p, n) = \bigg(1 + O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^{10}}\bigg)\bigg)\tau\frac{y}{(\log x)^r}. \tag{4.20}$$

(*ii*) *Uniformly for* $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ *and* $i \leqslant r$*,*

$$\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} w(p, q - h_i p) = \bigg(1 + O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^{10}}\bigg)\bigg)\tau\frac{u}{r}\frac{x}{2(\log x)^r}. \tag{4.21}$$

(*iii*) *Uniformly for* $(p, n) \in \mathcal{P} \times \mathbb{Z}$*,*

$$w(p, n) = O\big(x^{1/3+o(1)}\big). \tag{4.22}$$

We choose τ, u and $w : \mathcal{P} \times \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ according to Lemma 4.5, and define $w_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathcal{P} \times \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ by setting

$$w_{\mathcal{H}}(p,n) := \begin{cases} w(p,n) & \text{if } \mathcal{H} \cap n(p) = \varnothing \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

LEMMA 4.6. *Statements (i), (ii) and (iii) of Lemma 4.5 all hold with $w_{\mathcal{H}}$ in place of w, provided the hypothesis $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ in (ii) is replaced by the hypothesis $q \in \mathcal{Q}\backslash\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. We only need to consider (i) and (ii). For every $p \in \mathcal{P}$ we have

$$0 \leqslant \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} (w(p,n) - w_{\mathcal{H}}(p,n)) \leqslant \sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{\substack{|n|\leqslant y \\ n\equiv q_j\,(p)}} w(p,n) \ll x^{1/3+o(1)}y/p \ll x^{-2/3+o(1)}y,$$

which gives the analog of (4.20) for $w_{\mathcal{H}}$ in view of (4.19). For every $q \in \mathcal{Q}\backslash\mathcal{H}$ and $i \leqslant r$, we see similarly that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leqslant \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} (w(p, q-h_ip) - w_{\mathcal{H}}(p, q-h_ip)) \\ &\leqslant x^{1/3+o(1)} \sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{q-h_ip\equiv q_j\,(p)} 1 \leqslant x^{1/3+o(1)} \sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{p\mid q-q_j} 1 \ll x^{1/3+o(1)}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives the analog of (4.21). □

For each $p \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p$ denote the random integer with probability density

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p = n) := \frac{w_{\mathcal{H}}(p,n)}{\sum_{n'\in\mathbb{Z}} w_{\mathcal{H}}(p,n')}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Using Lemma 4.6, we verify that

$$\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}(q = \tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p + h_ip) = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Q}\backslash\mathcal{H}}(q)\left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^{10}}\right)\right)\frac{u}{r}\frac{x}{2y} \quad (q \in \mathcal{Q}, i \leqslant r), \tag{4.23}$$

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p = n) \ll x^{-2/3+o(1)} \quad (p \in \mathcal{P}, n \in \mathbb{Z}) \tag{4.24}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H} \cap \tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p(p) \neq \varnothing) = 0 \quad (p \in \mathcal{P}). \tag{4.25}$$

By (4.24), the analog of (4.23) holds with a single prime deleted from $\mathcal{P}$.

We choose the random vector $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}} := (\boldsymbol{a}_s(s))_{s\in\mathcal{S}}$ by selecting each $\boldsymbol{a}_s(s)$ uniformly at random from

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}(s) := (\mathbb{Z}/s\mathbb{Z})\backslash\{q(s) : q \in \mathcal{H}\}, \tag{4.26}$$

independently in s and independently of the $\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p$. Note, then, that for any random vector $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}$, $\mathcal{H} \subseteq S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})$.

The sifted set $S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})$ is a random periodic subset of $\mathbb{Z}$ with density

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{H}} := \prod_{s\in\mathcal{S}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\#\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}(s)}\right).$$

Let us compare $\sigma_{\mathcal{H}}$ with the quantity

$$\sigma := \prod_{s\in\mathcal{S}}\left(1-\frac{1}{s}\right)$$

defined in [**4**]. As $(\log x)^{20} - \log x \leqslant s - K \leqslant \#\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}(s) \leqslant s$ (cf. (4.3) and (4.7)), one may verify, in a straightforward manner, that

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{H}} = \sigma\left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{19}}\right)\right). \tag{4.27}$$

Consequently, in the estimates that follow, $\sigma_{\mathcal{H}}$ and σ are interchangeable.

As noted in [**4**], by the prime number theorem (with suitably strong error term), (4.2) and (4.3),

$$\sigma = \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^{10}}\right)\right)\frac{80\log_2 x}{\log x \log_3 x/\log_2 x},$$

so by (4.1) we have

$$\sigma y = \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^{10}}\right)\right)80cx\log_2 x. \tag{4.28}$$

Also, by (4.18) we have

$$\sigma^r = x^{o(1)}. \tag{4.29}$$

Let

$$X_p(\vec{a}) := \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p + h_i p \in S(\vec{a}) \text{ for all } i \leqslant r) \tag{4.30}$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}(\vec{a}) := \left\{p\in\mathcal{P} : X_p(\vec{a}) = \left(1 + O_{\leqslant}\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^6}\right)\right)\sigma^r\right\}. \tag{4.31}$$

It will transpire that with probability $1 - o(1)$, most primes in $\mathcal{P}$ lie in $\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})$.

We now define $\boldsymbol{n}_p$ in a slightly complicated way. Let

$$Z_p(\vec{a}; n) := \mathbf{1}_{(n+h_j p\in S(\vec{a})\ \forall j\leqslant r)}\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p = n).$$

Suppose we are in the event that $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}$. If $p \in \mathcal{P}\setminus\mathcal{P}(\vec{a})$, we set $\boldsymbol{n}_p = 0$. Otherwise, let $\boldsymbol{n}_p$ be the random integer with

$$\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{n}_p = n \mid \vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}) = \frac{Z_p(\vec{a}; n)}{X_p(\vec{a})}, \tag{4.32}$$

with the $\boldsymbol{n}_p$ jointly conditionally independent on the event $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}$. (We easily verify that $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} Z_p(\vec{a}; n) = X_p(\vec{a})$, so that (4.32) makes sense.)

Deduction of Theorem 4.4 (i) – (iii). Let $p \in \mathcal{P}$. We claim that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}\cap\boldsymbol{n}_p(p) \neq \varnothing) = 0.$$

To prove the claim it suffices to show $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}\cap\boldsymbol{n}_p(p)\neq\varnothing \mid \vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}) = 0$ for every $\vec{a}$. This is easily checked if $p \notin \mathcal{P}(\vec{a})$, since $\mathcal{H}\cap 0(p) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}\cap 0(p) = \varnothing$; otherwise

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}\cap\boldsymbol{n}_p(p)\neq\varnothing \mid \vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}) \leqslant \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}\cap\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p(p)\neq\varnothing)}{X_p(\vec{a})} = 0.$$

We see that Theorem 4.4 (i) and (ii) hold and we can now prove Theorem 4.4 (iii). Given $\vec{a}$ in the essential range of $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}$, and $q \in \mathcal{Q} \cap S(\vec{a})$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(q \in \boldsymbol{e}_p(\vec{a}) \mid \vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}) \leqslant \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{n}_p + h_i p = q \text{ for some } i \leqslant r \mid \vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}).$$

The right-hand side is 0 if $p \notin \mathcal{P}(\vec{a})$. Otherwise,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(q \in \boldsymbol{e}_p(\vec{a}) \mid \vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}) &\leqslant r \max_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{n}_p = n \mid \vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}) \ll r\sigma^{-r} \max_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p = n) \\ &\ll x^{-2/3+o(1)}.\end{aligned}$$

(Here, we have used (4.18), (4.24) and (4.29).) □

The following lemma is analogous to [**4**, Lemma 6.1].

LEMMA 4.7. *Let $n_1, \dots, n_t$ be distinct integers of magnitude $x^{O(1)}$, $t \leqslant \log x$, such that $\mathcal{H} \cap \{n_1, \dots, n_t\} = \varnothing$. Then for all sufficiently large x,*

$$\mathbb{P}(n_1, \dots, n_t \in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})) = \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\right)\right)\sigma^t,$$

where the implied constant is absolute.

Proof. For $s \in \mathcal{S}$, let $t_s := \#(\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}(s) \cap \{n_1(s), \dots, n_t(s)\})$. We have

$$\mathbb{P}(n_1, \dots, n_t \in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})) = \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left(1 - \frac{t_s}{\#\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}(s)}\right).$$

Note that for $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $1 - t_s/\#\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}(s) = 1 + O\left(t/s\right) = 1 + O\left(1/(\log x)^{19}\right)$.

Let $\mathcal{S}'$ be the set of primes $s \in \mathcal{S}$ such that either $n_i \equiv n_j(s)$ for some $i \neq j$ or $\mathcal{H} \cap n_i(s) \neq \varnothing$ for some i. For $i \neq j$ we have $1 \leqslant |n_i - n_j| \ll x^{O(1)}$, so $n_i - n_j$ has at most $O(\log x)$ prime divisors. Similarly, for each i and j, $n_i - q_j$ has at most $O(\log x)$ prime divisors. We see that $|\mathcal{S}'| \ll (t^2 + tK)\log x \ll (\log x)^3$ (cf. (4.7)), and

$$\begin{aligned}&\prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}'} \left(1 - \frac{t}{\#\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}(s)}\right)^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{t_s}{\#\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}(s)}\right) \\ &\qquad = \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}'} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{19}}\right)\right)^{|\mathcal{S}'|} = 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

For $s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}'$ we have $t_s = t$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left(1 - \frac{t_s}{\#\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}(s)}\right) &= \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\right)\right) \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left(1 - \frac{t}{\#\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}(s)}\right) \\ &= \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\right)\right)\sigma^t \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{t^2}{s^2}\right)\right) \\ &= \sigma^t \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

□

Deduction of Theorem 4.4 (iv). Let $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{Q}\backslash\mathcal{H}$. Recalling (4.8) and (4.7), we have

$$\#(\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})) = \#(\mathcal{R}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})) + K = \#(\mathcal{R}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})) + O_{\leqslant}(\log x). \tag{4.33}$$

Let $X := \sum_{q\in\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{1}_{q\in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}X = \sum_{q\in\mathcal{R}} \mathbb{P}(q\in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})) = (\#\mathcal{R})\sigma\bigg(1+O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\bigg)\bigg)$$

from Lemma 4.7. Note that by (4.6) we have

$$(\#\mathcal{Q})\sigma = \frac{\sigma y}{\log x}\bigg(1+O\bigg(\frac{\log_2 x}{\log x}\bigg)\bigg).$$

By (4.33), the same estimate holds for $(\#\mathcal{R})\sigma$, and

$$\mathbb{E}\#(\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})) = \frac{\sigma y}{\log x}\bigg(1+O\bigg(\frac{\log_2 x}{\log x}\bigg)\bigg). \tag{4.34}$$

We similarly have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}X^2 &= \sum_{q_1\in\mathcal{R}}\sum_{q_2\in\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{1}_{q_1,q_2\in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}\\ &= \sum_{\substack{(q_1,q_2)\in\mathcal{R}^2\\ q_1\neq q_2}} \sigma^2\bigg(1+O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\bigg)\bigg) + \sum_{q\in\mathcal{R}} \sigma\bigg(1+O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\bigg)\bigg)\\ &= \sigma^2(\#\mathcal{R})^2\bigg(1+O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\bigg)\bigg).\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}(X-\mathbb{E}X)^2 = \mathbb{E}X^2 - (\mathbb{E}X)^2 \ll \frac{\sigma^2(\#\mathcal{R})^2}{(\log x)^{16}}. \tag{4.35}$$

Now we use Chebyshev's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\big(|X-\mathbb{E}X| > (\#\mathcal{R})\sigma(\log x)^{-3}\big) &\leqslant (\#\mathcal{R})^{-2}\sigma^{-2}(\log x)^6\,\mathbb{E}(X-\mathbb{E}X)^2\\ &\ll \frac{1}{(\log x)^{10}}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

Recalling (4.33) again we get

$$\#(\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})) = \frac{\sigma y}{\log x}\bigg(1+O\bigg(\frac{\log_2 x}{\log x}\bigg)\bigg)$$

with probability $1-O((\log x)^{-10})$, and Theorem 4.4 (iv) follows on recalling that, by (4.28), $\sigma y/\log x \sim 80cx\log_2 x/\log x$. □

Lemma 4.8. (*i*) *With probability* $1-O\big(\frac{1}{\log x}\big)$, $\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})$ *contains all but* $O\big(\frac{\#\mathcal{P}}{(\log x)^3}\big)$ *of the primes in* $\mathcal{P}$. (*ii*) *We have*

$$\mathbb{E}\,\#\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}) = (\#\mathcal{P})\bigg(1+O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^4}\bigg)\bigg).$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\, X_p(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}) &= \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p = n)\mathbb{P}(n + h_i p \in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})\ \forall i \leqslant r)\\ &= \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p = p)\sigma^r\bigg(1 + O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\bigg)\bigg)\\ &= \sigma^r\bigg(1 + O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\bigg)\bigg).\end{aligned}$$

(For the second step, we supplement Lemma 4.7 with the observation that $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{n}_p = n) = 0$ whenever $n + h_i p \in \mathcal{H}$ for some $i \leqslant r$.)

Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(2)}$ be independent random variables having the same probability distribution as $\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}X_p(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})^2 &= \mathbb{P}\big(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(1)} \in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})\ \forall i \leqslant r\big)\mathbb{P}\big(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(2)} \in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})\ \forall i \leqslant r\big)\\ &= \mathbb{P}\big(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(l)} \in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})\ \forall l \leqslant 2, i \leqslant r\big).\end{aligned}$$

Arguing as above,

$$\mathbb{E}X_p(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})^2 = \sum_{n_1\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{n_2\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{P}\big(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(1)} = n_1\big)\mathbb{P}\big(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(2)} = n_2\big)\sigma^{t(n_1,n_2)}\bigg(1 + O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\bigg)\bigg),$$

where $t(n_1, n_2)$ is the number of distinct integers $n_l + h_i p$ ($l \leqslant 2$, $i \leqslant r$).

Now fix n_1. There are less than r^2 values of n_2 for which $t(n_1, n_2) \neq 2r$. Since $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{n}_p^{(2)} = n_2) \ll x^{-2/3+o(1)}$ (cf. (4.24)), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}X_p(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})^2\\ &\quad= \sum_{n_1\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(1)} = n_1)\bigg\{\sigma^r\bigg(1 + O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\bigg)\bigg)\bigg(1 - O\bigg(\frac{1}{x^{1/2}}\bigg)\bigg) + O\bigg(\frac{1}{x^{1/2}}\bigg)\bigg\}\\ &\quad= \sigma^{2r}\bigg(1 + O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\bigg)\bigg).\end{aligned}$$

Arguing as in (4.35), (4.36),

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(|X_p(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}) - \big(1 + O\big(\tfrac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\big)\big)\sigma^r| > \tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{\sigma^r}{(\log x)^6}\Big) \ll \frac{1}{(\log x)^4}.$$

Thus, with probability $1 - O\big(1/(\log x)^4\big)$, we have

$$X_p(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}) = \bigg(1 + O_{\leqslant}\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^6}\bigg)\bigg)\sigma^r,$$

that is, $p \in \mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\#\mathcal{P}}{(\log x)^3}\mathbb{P}\Big(\textstyle\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \mathbf{1}_{p\notin\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})} > \frac{\#\mathcal{P}}{(\log x)^3}\Big)\\ &\qquad\leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \mathbf{1}_{p\notin\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}\Big) = \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}(p \notin \mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})) \ll \frac{\#\mathcal{P}}{(\log x)^4}.\end{aligned}$$

So with probability $1-\big(1/\log x\big)$, $\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})$ contains all but $O\big(\frac{\#\mathcal{P}}{(\log x)^3}\big)$ of the primes $p\in\mathcal{P}$. Finally,

$$\mathbb{E}\,\#\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})=\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\mathbb{P}(p\in\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}))=(\#\mathcal{P})\bigg(1+O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^4}\bigg)\bigg).$$

□

Lemma 4.9. *Let $q\in\mathcal{Q}$ and let $\vec{a}$ be in the essential range of $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}$. Then*

$$\sigma^{-r}\sum_{i=1}^{r}\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\vec{a})}Z_p(\vec{a};q-h_ip)=\big(1+O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^6}\bigg)\bigg)\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\mathbb{P}(q\in\boldsymbol{e}_p(\vec{a})\mid\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}=\vec{a}).\tag{4.37}$$

Proof. Recalling (4.32), the left-hand side of (4.37) is

$$\sigma^{-r}\sum_{i=1}^{r}\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\vec{a})}X_p(\vec{a})\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{n}_p=q-h_ip\mid\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}=\vec{a})$$
$$=\bigg(1+O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^6}\bigg)\bigg)\sigma^{-r}\sum_{i=1}^{r}\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\vec{a})}\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{n}_p=q-h_ip\mid\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}=\vec{a}).$$

Since $q-h_ip\neq\boldsymbol{n}_p$ if $p\notin\mathcal{P}(\vec{a})$, we may rewrite this as

$$\bigg(1+O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log x)^6}\bigg)\bigg)\sigma^{-r}\sum_{i=1}^{r}\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{n}_p=q-h_ip\mid\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}=\vec{a}),$$

and the lemma follows. □

It is convenient to write

$$U(q,\vec{a}):=\sigma^{-r}\sum_{i=1}^{r}\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}}Z_p(\vec{a};q-h_ip).$$

Lemma 4.10. *We have*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}\sigma^rU(q,\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})\Big)=\bigg(1+O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^{10}}\bigg)\bigg)\frac{\sigma y}{\log x}\frac{\sigma^{r-1}ux}{2y}\tag{4.38}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}\sigma^rU(q,\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})^2\Big)=\bigg(1+O\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^{10}}\bigg)\bigg)\frac{\sigma y}{\log x}\bigg(\frac{\sigma^{r-1}ux}{2y}\bigg)^2.\tag{4.39}$$

Proof. We begin with (4.39). Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(2)}$ be independent copies of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p$ that are also independent of $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}$. We observe that for any n_1,n_2, and $p_1,p_2\in\mathcal{P}$,

$$Z_{p_1}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}};n_1)Z_{p_2}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}};n_2)=\mathbf{1}_{(n_l+h_jp_l\in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})\ \forall l\leqslant 2,\,j\leqslant r)}\,\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(1)}=n_1)\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(2)}=n_2).$$

The left-hand side of (4.39) is thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}\sum_{i_1,i_2=1}^{r}\sum_{p_1,p_2\in\mathcal{P}}Z_{p_1}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}};q-h_{i_1}p_1)Z_{p_2}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}};q-h_{i_2}p_2)\Big)\\&=\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}}\sum_{i_1,i_2=1}^{r}\Big(\mathbb{P}(q+(h_j-h_{i_l})p_l\in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})\ \forall l\leqslant 2,j\leqslant r)\\&\qquad\qquad\times\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_{p_1}^{(1)}=q-h_{i_1}p_1)\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_{p_2}^{(2)}=q-h_{i_2}p_2)\Big).\end{aligned}\tag{4.40}$$

(For $q\in\mathcal{Q}$, the event $q+(h_j-h_{i_l})p_l\in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})\ \forall l\leqslant 2,j\leqslant r$ is identical to the event $q\in\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})$, $q+(h_j-h_{i_l})p_l\in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})\ \forall l\leqslant 2,j\leqslant r$.)

Let Σ_1,Σ_2 be the contributions to the right-hand side of (4.40) from $p_1\neq p_2$, respectively $p_1=p_2$.

Fix p_1,p_2 in $\mathcal{P}$ with $p_1\neq p_2$, and fix $i_1,i_2\leqslant r$. The number of distinct integers $q+(h_j-h_{i_l})p_l$ ($l\leqslant 2,j\leqslant r$) is $2r-1$ since $(h_j-h_{i_1})p_1\neq(h_j-h_{i_2})p_2$ for $i_1\neq j$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}(q+(h_j-h_{i_l})p_l\in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})\ \forall l\leqslant 2,j\leqslant r)\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(1)}=q-h_{i_1}p_1)\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(2)}=q-h_{i_2}p_2)\\&\quad=\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\right)\right)\sigma^{2r-1}\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(1)}=q-h_{i_1}p_1)\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(2)}=q-h_{i_2}p_2).\end{aligned}\tag{4.41}$$

(Both sides are 0 if there are j,i_l with $q+(h_j-h_{i_l})p_l\in\mathcal{H}$; otherwise Lemma 4.7 applies.)

We combine (4.41) with the remark after (4.25) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_1&=\sum_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{Q}\setminus\mathcal{H}\\ i_1,i_2\leqslant r}}\sigma^{2r-1}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^{10}}\right)\right)\left(\frac{ux}{2ry}\right)^2\\&=\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^{10}}\right)\right)\frac{\sigma y}{\log x}\left(\frac{\sigma^{r-1}ux}{2y}\right)^2.\end{aligned}\tag{4.42}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_2&=\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}}\sum_{i_1=1}^{r}\sum_{p_1\in\mathcal{P}}\mathbb{P}(q+(h_j-h_{i_1})p_1\in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})\ \forall j\leqslant r)\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(1)}=q-h_{i_1}p_1)^2\\&\ll x^{-3/5}\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}}\sum_{i_1=1}^{r}\sum_{p_1\in\mathcal{P}}\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p^{(1)}=q-h_{i_1}p_1)\\&\ll x^{-3/5}(\#\mathcal{Q}),\end{aligned}$$

which together with (4.42) yields (4.39).

Much the same argument gives for the left-hand side of (4.38) the expression

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}}\sum_{i=1}^{r}\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}}&\mathbb{P}(q+(h_j-h_i)p\in S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})\ \forall j\leqslant r)\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p=q-h_ip)\\&=\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}}\sum_{i=1}^{r}\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\biggl(1+O\biggl(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\biggr)\biggr)\sigma^r\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p=q-h_ip)\\&=\biggl(1+O\biggl(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^{10}}\biggr)\biggr)\frac{\sigma y}{\log x}\frac{\sigma^{r-1}ux}{2y}.\end{aligned}$$

□

We now specify that the quantity C in Theorem 4.4 is

$$C:=\frac{ux}{2\sigma y},$$

so that $C\asymp 1/c$.

Lemma 4.11. *With probability $1-o(1)$, we have*

$$U(q,\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})=\biggl(1+O_{\leqslant}\biggl(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^3}\biggr)\biggr)C$$

for all but at most $\frac{x}{2\log x\log_2 x}$ of the primes $q\in\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})$.

Proof. Using (4.34) and Lemma 4.10, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}(U(q,\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})-C)^2\Big)\\&=\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}U(q,\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})^2\Big)-2C\,\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}U(q,\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})\Big)+C^2\,\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}1\Big)\\&=\biggl(1+O\biggl(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^{10}}\biggr)\biggr)\frac{u^2x^2}{4\sigma y\log x}\\&\qquad-\biggl(1+O\biggl(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^{10}}\biggr)\biggr)\frac{2ux}{2\sigma y}\frac{ux}{2\log x}+\bigl(1+O\bigl(\tfrac{1}{\log x}\bigr)\bigr)\frac{u^2x^2}{4\sigma^2y^2}\frac{\sigma y}{\log x}\\&\ll\frac{u^2x^2}{\sigma y(\log x)(\log_2 x)^{10}}\\&\ll\frac{C^2\sigma y}{(\log x)(\log_2 x)^{10}}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.43}$$

Let V be the event

$$\#\bigl\{q\in\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}):|U(q,\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})-C|>\tfrac{C}{(\log_2 x)^3}\bigr\}>\frac{x}{2\log x\log_2 x}.$$

Evidently

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}(U(q,\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})-C)^2\Big)\geqslant\mathbb{P}(V)\frac{x}{2\log x\log_2 x}\frac{C^2}{(\log_2 x)^6}.$$

Combining this with (4.43), and recalling that $\sigma y \asymp x \log_2 x$ (cf. (4.28)), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(V) \ll \frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^2}.$$

□

Lemma 4.12. *We have*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \sigma^{-r} \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})} Z_p(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}; n)\Big) = \Big(1 + O\Big(\frac{1}{(\log x)^4}\Big)\Big)(\#\mathcal{P}) \tag{4.44}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \sigma^{-r} \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}\setminus\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})} Z_p(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}; n)\Big) \ll \frac{\#\mathcal{P}}{(\log x)^4}. \tag{4.45}$$

Proof. The left-hand side of (4.44) is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma^{-r} \sum_{\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}} \mathbb{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}) \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\vec{a})} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{P}(n + h_i p \in S(\vec{a}) \ \forall i \leqslant r)\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p = n) \\
&\quad = \sigma^{-r} \sum_{\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}} \mathbb{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}) \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\vec{a})} X_p(\vec{a}) \\
&\quad = \Big(1 + O\Big(\frac{1}{(\log x)^6}\Big)\Big) \sum_{\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}} \mathbb{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}} = \vec{a}) \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\vec{a})} 1 \\
&\quad = \Big(1 + O\Big(\frac{1}{(\log x)^6}\Big)\Big) \mathbb{E}\,\#\mathcal{P}(\vec{a}) \\
&\quad = \Big(1 + O\Big(\frac{1}{(\log x)^4}\Big)\Big)(\#\mathcal{P})
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 4.8. This proves (4.44).

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \sigma^{-r} \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} Z_p(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}; n)\Big) &= \sigma^{-r} \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p = n)\mathbb{P}(n + h_j p \in S(\vec{a}) \ \forall j \leqslant r) \\
&= \Big(1 + O\Big(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\Big)\Big) \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}_p = n) \\
&= \Big(1 + O\Big(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{16}}\Big)\Big)(\#\mathcal{P}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.46}$$

(Here we have used Lemma 4.7 with a familiar argument.) We obtain (4.45) on subtracting (4.44) from (4.46). □

Deduction of Theorem 4.4 (v). In view of Lemmas 4.9 and 4.11 it suffices to show that with probability $1 - O\big(1/(\log x)^3\big)$, the number of q in $\mathcal{Q} \cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})$ with

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}\setminus\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})} \sigma^{-r} Z_p(a; q - h_i p) > \frac{ux}{\sigma y (\log_2 x)^3} \tag{4.47}$$

is at most $\frac{x}{2\log x\log_2 x}$.

Let W be the event that (4.47) holds for more than $\frac{x}{2\log x\log_2 x}$ primes in $\mathcal{Q}\cap S(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(W)\leqslant \mathbb{P}\Big(\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}}\sum_{i=1}^{r}\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}\setminus\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}\sigma^{-r}Z_p(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}};q-h_ip)>v\Big),$$

where

$$v:=\frac{ux}{\sigma y(\log_2 x)^3}\cdot\frac{x}{2\log x\log_2 x}=\frac{x}{(\log x)^{2-o(1)}}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(W)&\leqslant\frac{1}{v}\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}}\sum_{i=1}^{r}\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}\setminus\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}\sigma^{-r}Z_p(q-h_ip)\Big)\\&\leqslant\frac{r}{v}\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\sigma^{-r}\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}\setminus\mathcal{P}(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}})}Z_p(\vec{\boldsymbol{a}};n)\Big)\ll\frac{r}{v}\frac{x}{(\log x)^5}\ll\frac{1}{(\log x)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

□

4.3. **Proof of Theorem 4.1.** We require one further lemma for the proof of Theorem 4.1, viz. the following, which is a special case of [**4**, Corollary 3].

Lemma 4.13. *Let $\mathcal{Q}'$ be a set of primes with $\#\mathcal{Q}'>(\log_2 x)^3$. For each $p\in\mathcal{P}$, let $\boldsymbol{e}_p$ be a random subset of $\mathcal{Q}'$ with*

$$\#\boldsymbol{e}_p\leqslant r,\quad \mathbb{P}(q\in\boldsymbol{e}_p)\leqslant x^{-3/5}\quad(q\in\mathcal{Q}').$$

Suppose that for all but at most $\frac{\#\mathcal{Q}'}{(\log_2 x)^2}$ elements $q\in\mathcal{Q}'$, we have

$$\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\mathbb{P}(q\in\boldsymbol{e}_p)=C+O_{\leqslant}\bigg(\frac{1}{(\log_2 x)^2}\bigg),$$

where C is independent of q and

$$\tfrac{5}{4}\log 5\leqslant C\ll 1. \tag{4.48}$$

Suppose that for any distinct $q_1,q_2\in\mathcal{Q}'$,

$$\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}'}\mathbb{P}(q_1,q_2\in\boldsymbol{e}_p)\leqslant x^{-1/20}. \tag{4.49}$$

Then for any positive integer m with

$$m\leqslant\frac{\log_3 x}{\log 5},$$

we can find random sets $\boldsymbol{e}'_p\subseteq\mathcal{Q}'$ for each $p\in\mathcal{P}$ such that $\boldsymbol{e}'_p$ is either empty or is in the essential range of $\boldsymbol{e}_p$, and

$$\#\{q\in\mathcal{Q}':q\notin\boldsymbol{e}'_p\text{ for all }p\in\mathcal{P}\}\sim 5^{-m}(\#\mathcal{Q}'), \tag{4.50}$$

with probability $1-o(1)$.

Deduction of Theorem 4.1. By (4.15), we may choose c small enough so that (4.48) holds. Take

$$m = \Big\lfloor \frac{\log_3 x}{\log 5} \Big\rfloor.$$

Let $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}$ and $\vec{\boldsymbol{n}}$ be as in Theorem 4.4. Suppose that we are in the probability $1-o(1)$ event that $\vec{\boldsymbol{a}}$ takes a value $\vec{a}$ for which (4.17) holds. Fix some $\vec{a}$ within this event. We apply Lemma 4.13 with $\mathcal{Q}' = \mathcal{Q} \cap S(\vec{a})$, $\boldsymbol{e}_p = \boldsymbol{e}_p(\vec{a})$. We need only check the hypothesis (4.49). We have

$$\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}(q_1, q_2 \in e_p(\vec{a}) \leqslant \sum_{\substack{p \mid q_1-q_2 \\ p\in\mathcal{P}}} \mathbb{P}(q_1 \in e_p(\vec{a})) \leqslant x^{-3/5}$$

(the sum has at most one term).

Let $\boldsymbol{e}'_p(\vec{a})$ be the random variables provided by Lemma 4.13. Recalling (4.16),

$$\#\{q \in \mathcal{Q}' : q \notin \boldsymbol{e}'_p \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{P}\} \sim 5^{-m} \#(\mathcal{Q} \cap S(\vec{a})) \ll \frac{x}{\log x}$$

with probability $1 - o(1)$. Since $e'_p(\vec{a})$ is either empty or

$$e'_p(\vec{a}) = \{\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}'_p + h_i p : i \leqslant r\} \cap \mathcal{Q} \cap S(\vec{a})$$

for some random integer $\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}'_p$, it follows that

$$\#\{q \in \mathcal{Q} \cap S(\vec{a}) : q \not\equiv \tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}'_p(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{P}\} \ll \frac{x}{\log x}$$

with probability $1 - o(1)$. The bound (4.9) follows on setting $b_p = n'_p$ for a specific $\vec{n}' = (\tilde{\boldsymbol{n}}'_p)$ for which this bound holds. That $\mathcal{H}$ is contained in $S(\vec{a}) \cap S(\vec{b})$ follows from parts (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.4. □

5. A modification of Maynard–Tao

Definition 5.1. We consider functions of the form $f_1 : [T_1, \infty) \to [x_1, \infty)$, with $T_1, x_1 \geqslant 1$. Let us say that such a function f_1 is "of the first kind" if and only if (i) it is a strictly increasing bijection, (ii) $f_1(T) \leqslant \log T$ for $T \geqslant T_1$, (iii) $f_1(2T)/f_1(T) \to 1$ as $T \to \infty$ and (iv) for $0 < \eta \leqslant 1$, there exists $L_\eta \geqslant 1$ such that $f_1(T)/f_1(T^\eta) \to L_\eta$ as $T \to \infty$. □

Definition 5.2. We consider (possibly empty) sets $\mathcal{Z}(T)$, $T \geqslant 2$, of primes less than or equal to T. Let us that such a set is "repulsive" if and only if for any $p' \in \mathcal{Z}(T)$, $\sum_{p\in\mathcal{Z}(T),\, p\geqslant p'} 1/p \ll 1/p' \ll 1/\log_2 T$. □

Given a function $\upsilon : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}$ with finite support and any arithmetic progression $a\,(D)$ with $(a, D) = 1$, we define

$$\Delta(\upsilon; a\,(D)) := \sum_{n\equiv a\,(D)} \upsilon(n) - \frac{1}{\phi(D)} \sum_{(n,D)=1} \upsilon(n),$$

where ϕ is Euler's totient function.

Hypothesis 5.3. *Fix $\theta \in (0, 1]$ and a function $f_1 : [T_1, \infty) \to [x_1, \infty)$ of the first kind. For any given $A > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, \theta)$, if $\eta = \eta(A, \delta) \in (0, \theta - \delta)$ is a sufficiently*

small, fixed number then, for $N \geqslant T_1^{1/\eta}$, there is a repulsive subset $\mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{Z}(N^{4\eta})$ of the primes less than or equal to $N^{4\eta}$ such that, with $W := \prod_{p \leqslant N^\eta,\, p \notin \mathcal{Z}} p$ and $Z := \prod_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} p$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{r \leqslant N^\theta/(N^\delta W) \\ (r, WZ)=1 \\ r \text{ squarefree}}} \max_{N \leqslant M \leqslant 2N} \max_{(rW,a)=1} |\Delta(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{1}_{(M,M+N]}; a\,(rW))| \ll_{\delta,A} \frac{N}{\phi(W)(\log N)^A}.$$

THEOREM 5.4. *Fix $\theta \in (0,1]$ and a function $f_1 : [T_1, \infty) \to [x_1, \infty)$ of the first kind. Suppose that Hypothesis 5.3 holds. Fix a positive integer a. In the notation of Hypothesis 5.3, if $K = K_{\theta,a}$ is a sufficiently large integer multiple of $\lceil (2/\theta)a \rceil + 1$, if $A = A_K$ is sufficiently large and if $\delta = \delta_{\theta,a}$ is sufficiently small, then the following holds for $N \geqslant N(T_1, K, \eta)$. Let $\mathcal{H} := \{H_1, \dots, H_K\} \subseteq [0, N]$ be an admissible set of K distinct integers for which $\prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant K} (H_j - H_i)$ is $f_1(N^\eta)$-smooth, and let b be an integer such that*

$$(\textstyle\prod_{i=1}^K (b + H_i), W) = 1.$$

Then for any partition

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{H}_{\lceil (2/\theta)a \rceil + 1}$$

of $\mathcal{H}$ into $\lceil (2/\theta)a \rceil + 1$ sets of equal size, there exists some $n \in (N, 2N] \cap b(W)$, and $a+1$ distinct indices $i_1, \dots, i_{a+1} \in \{1, \dots, \lceil (2/\theta)a \rceil + 1\}$, such that

$$\#(\mathbf{P} \cap n + \mathcal{H}_{i_1}), \dots, \#(\mathbf{P} \cap n + \mathcal{H}_{i_{a+1}}) \geqslant 1.$$

THEOREM 5.5. *Hypothesis 5.3, and therefore the statement of Theorem 5.4, holds with $\theta = 1/2$ and any function $f_1 : [T_1, \infty) \to [x_1, \infty)$ of the first kind.*

Proof of Theorems 5.5 and 5.4. That Hypothesis 5.3 holds with $\theta = 1/2$ and any function $f_1 : [T_1, \infty) \to [x_1, \infty)$ of the first kind is a consequence of Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 of [**1**].

We prove Theorem 5.4 by following Pintz's [**11**] modification to the proof of Theorem 4.3 (i) in [**1**]. There are many parameters involved and it is important to keep track of their interdependencies. It is also important to note that the implicit constants in all O-terms are absolute, that is, independent of all parameters.

Only the unconditional case $\theta = 1/2$ is considered in [**1**, **11**], whereas here we are considering $\theta \leqslant 1$. To do this, we need to note that on Hypothesis 5.3, the term $4 + O(\delta)$ may be replaced by $(2/\theta) + O(\delta)$ on the right-hand side of the inequality in [**1**, Lemma 4.5 (iii)]. In the proof of this lemma in [**1**, §4.2], the support of the smooth function $G : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$, which is $[0, 1/4 - 2\delta]$, may be replaced by $[0, (\theta/2) - 2\delta]$, and the rest of the proof may be carried out, mutatis mutandis.

As in [**11**], we begin with the following observation. Suppose K and M are positive integers with $M \mid K$, and let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{H}_M$ be a partition of a set $\mathcal{H}$ of integers into M subsets of equal size. Suppose also that μ' and μ are

positive real numbers with

$$\mu' := \max_{v\in\mathbb{N}} \left(v - \mu\binom{v}{2} \right).$$

Given an integer n, consider the expression

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M} \Big\{ \sum_{H\in\mathcal{H}_j} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{P}}(n+H) - \mu \sum_{\substack{H,H'\in\mathcal{H}_j \\ H\neq H'}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{P}}(n+H)\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{P}}(n+H') \Big\},$$

where in the double sum each unordered pair $\{H, H'\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_j$ with $H \neq H'$ is counted once only. Suppose $\#(\mathbf{P} \cap n + \mathcal{H}_j) = 0$ for all but at most a of the subsets $\mathcal{H}_j$. Then the above expression is at most $\mu' a$. Consequently, if

$$\sum_{H\in\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{P}}(n+H) - \mu' a - \mu \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{H,H'\in\mathcal{H}_j \\ H\neq H'}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{P}}(n+H)\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{P}}(n+H')$$

is positive then $\#(\mathbf{P} \cap n + \mathcal{H}_j) \geqslant 1$ for at least $a+1$ of the subsets $\mathcal{H}_j$.

Note that when μ is the reciprocal of a positive integer, we have

$$\mu' = \tfrac{1}{2}\big(1 + \tfrac{1}{\mu}\big),$$

the maximum being attained when $v = 1/\mu$ and $v = 1 + 1/\mu$.

Now, fix $\theta \in (0, 1]$ and a function $f_1 : [T_1, \infty) \to [x_1, \infty)$ of the first kind. Suppose that Hypothesis 5.3 holds. Fix any positive integer a and let $M = M_{\theta,a}$ be the integer satisfying

$$M - 2 < (2/\theta)a \leqslant M - 1.$$

Let $\iota = \iota_{\theta,a}$ be a small, fixed quantity to be specified. Set

$$\delta = \delta_{\theta,a} := \iota^2/(aM).$$

Let $K = K_{\theta,a}$ be the integer satisfying

$$\mathrm{e}^{aM^2/(\delta(M-1))} < K \leqslant \mathrm{e}^{aM^2/(\delta(M-1))} + M \quad \text{and} \quad M \mid K.$$

Finally, let

$$\rho := \frac{aM^2/(M-1)}{\delta \log K} < 1.$$

Now let $A = A(K)$, $\eta = \eta(A, \delta)$, $N \geqslant N(T_1, K, \eta)$, $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, \dots, H_K\}$ and $b(W)$ be as in the statement of the theorem. Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{H}_M$ be any partition of $\mathcal{H}$ into M subsets of equal size. Consider the expression

$$S := \sum_{\substack{N<n\leqslant 2N \\ n\equiv b(W)}} \Big\{ \sum_{H\in\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{P}}(n+H) - \frac{1+M}{2}a - \frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{H,H'\in\mathcal{H}_j \\ H\neq H'}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{P}}(n+H)\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{P}}(n+H') \Big\} \nu_{\mathcal{H}}(n),$$

where $\nu_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathbb{N} \to [0, \infty)$ is the nonnegative weight given by

$$\nu_{\mathcal{H}}(n) := \Big(\sum_{\substack{d_1,\dots,d_K \\ d_i \mid n+H_i \ \forall i\leqslant K}} \lambda_{d_1,\dots,d_K} \Big)^2,$$

and where $(\lambda_{d_1,\dots,d_K})$ is the Maynard–Tao sieve as used in [**1**, §4]. The aim is to show that $S > 0$, for in that case, by the observation made at the beginning of the proof, there must exist some $n \in (N, 2N] \cap b(W)$ and $a+1$ subsets $\mathcal{H}_j$ for which $\#(\mathbf{P} \cap n + \mathcal{H}_j) \geqslant 1$.

At this point we invoke Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 in [**1**] (with $4+O(\delta)$ in the latter replaced by $2/\theta + O(\delta) \leqslant (M-1)/a + O(\delta)$). To ease notation define $\mathfrak{S}$ by the relation $S = \mathfrak{S}NW^{-1}B^{-K}I_K(F)$, with B and $I_K(F)$ as defined in [**1**, §4.2]. Also let $\xi = (\log K)^{-1/2}$.

As in [**1**, §4.2] and [**11**, (3.13)], we find that the relevant estimates yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{S} &\geqslant \sum_{H\in\mathcal{H}} \frac{aM^2/(M-1)}{K}(1+O(\xi)) - \frac{1+M}{2}a \\ &\qquad - \frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{H,H'\in\mathcal{H}_j\\ H\neq H'}} \frac{M-1}{a}\cdot\frac{(aM^2/(M-1))^2}{K^2}(1+O(\delta+\xi)) \\ &= \frac{aM^2}{M-1}(1+O(\xi)) - \frac{1+M}{2}a - \binom{K/M}{2}\frac{aM^4(1+O(\delta+\xi))}{K^2(M-1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\mathrm{e}^{aM^2/(\delta(M-1))} < K$, we see that $M/K < \delta$ and hence

$$\binom{K/M}{2} = \frac{K^2}{2M^2}\Big(1-\frac{M}{K}\Big) = \frac{K^2}{2M^2}(1+O(\delta)).$$

We also have $\xi^2 < \delta/(aM) = \iota^2/(a^2M^2)$, so $\delta + \xi = O(\iota/(aM))$. We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{S} &\geqslant \frac{aM^2}{M-1}\Big(1+O\Big(\frac{\iota}{aM}\Big)\Big) - \frac{1+M}{2}a - \frac{aM^2}{2(M-1)}\Big(1+O\Big(\frac{\iota}{aM}\Big)\Big) \\ &= \frac{a(1+O(\iota))}{2(M-1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Taking ι sufficiently small gives $\mathfrak{S} > 0$, and hence $S > 0$, as desired. □

6. Main Theorem and Deduction of Theorem 1.1

Recall Definition 5.1, in which functions "of the first kind" are introduced. We now define a second kind of function.

Definition 6.1. We consider functions $f_2 : [x_2, \infty) \to [z_2, \infty)$, with $x_2, z_2 \geqslant 1$. Let us say that such a function f_2 is "of the second kind" if and only if (i) it is a strictly increasing bijection, (ii)

$$(x/\log x)/f_2(x) \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(x)/(x\log x\log_3 x/\log_2 x) \to 0$$

as $x \to \infty$ and (iii) for any $C > 0$, $f_2(Cx)/(Cf(x)) \to 1$ as $x \to \infty$. □

Theorem 6.2. *Fix $\theta \in (0,1]$ and a function $f_1 : [T_1, \infty) \to [x_1, \infty)$ of the first kind, and suppose Hypothesis 5.3 holds. Fix a function $f_2 : [x_1, \infty) \to [z_2, \infty)$ of the second kind and let $f := f_2 \circ f_1$. Let $d_n := p_{n+1} - p_n$, where p_n denotes the nth smallest prime, and let $\boldsymbol{L}_f$ denote the set of limit points in $[0,\infty]$ of the sequence $(d_n/f(p_n))_{p_n \geqslant T_1}$. Then*

given any $\lceil(2/\theta)\rceil+1$ *nonnegative real numbers* $\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_{\lceil(2/\theta)\rceil+1}$ *with*

$$\alpha_1 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \alpha_{\lceil(2/\theta)\rceil+1},$$

we have

$$\{\alpha_j-\alpha_i : 1\leqslant i<j\leqslant \lceil(2/\theta)\rceil+1\}\cap \boldsymbol{L}_f\neq\varnothing. \tag{6.1}$$

Consequently, letting λ *denote the Lebesgue measure on* $\mathbb{R}$*, we have*

$$\lambda([0,X]\cap \boldsymbol{L}_f)\geqslant c_1(\theta)X \quad (X\geqslant 0) \tag{6.2}$$

and

$$\lambda([0,X]\cap \boldsymbol{L}_f)\geqslant (1-o(1))c_2(\theta)X \quad (X\to\infty), \tag{6.3}$$

where

$$c_1(\theta):=(\lceil(2/\theta)\rceil(1+1/2+\cdots+1/\lceil(2/\theta)\rceil))^{-1} \quad \textit{and} \quad c_2(\theta):=1/\lceil(2/\theta)\rceil. \tag{6.4}$$

θ	$\lceil(2/\theta)\rceil+1$	$c_1(\theta)$	$c_2(\theta)$
$1/2\leqslant\theta<2/3$	5	3/25	1/4
$2/3\leqslant\theta<1$	4	2/11	1/3
$\theta=1$	3	1/3	1/2

TABLE 1. Possible values of $\lceil(2/\theta)\rceil+1$, $c_1(\theta)$ and $c_2(\theta)$.

Deduction of Theorem 1.1. In view of Theorem 5.5, we may unconditionally apply Theorem 6.2 with $\theta=1/2$ and any function $f_1:[T_1,\infty)\to[x_1,\infty)$ of the first kind. Let $f_1:[\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{e}}},\infty)\to[\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{e}},\infty)$ be given by $f_1(T)=\log T$, and let $f_2:[\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{e}},\infty)\to[\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{e}+1},\infty)$ be given by $f_2(x)=x\log x/\log_2 x$. Then f_1 is of the first kind, f_2 is of the second kind and $f_2\circ f_1(T)=R_1(T)=\log T\log_2 T/\log_3 T$ for $T\geqslant \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{e}}}$. □

LEMMA 6.3. *Let* K *be a natural number and let* $K=K_1+\cdots+K_M$ *be a partition of* K*. Let* x *and* y *be real numbers such that* $K\leqslant y/x\leqslant\log x$*. If* x *is sufficiently large, then for any* M *(possibly overlapping) subintervals* $(v_i,v_i+x/\log x]\subseteq(x,y]$*,* $i\leqslant M$*, there exist* M *pairwise disjoint sets of primes* $\mathcal{H}_i\subseteq(v_i,v_i+x/\log x]$ *with* $|\mathcal{H}_i|=K_i$*, such that if* $\mathcal{H}_1\cup\cdots\cup\mathcal{H}_M=\{q_1,\dots,q_K\}$*, then* $\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant K}(q_j-q_i)$ *is* x*-smooth.*

Proof. For any M sets $\mathcal{J}_i$ with $|\mathcal{J}_i|\geqslant K$, $i\leqslant M$, there exist M pairwise disjoint sets $\mathcal{H}_i$ such that $\mathcal{H}_i\subseteq\mathcal{J}_i$ and $|\mathcal{H}_i|=K_i$, $i\leqslant M$. For the sets $\mathcal{J}_i$, let D be the integer satisfying $y/x\leqslant D<1+y/x$. As $D<1+\log x$ and $y\leqslant x\log x$, a suitably strong version of the prime number theorem for arithmetic progressions (cf. [**2**, §22 (4)]) yields, for $(v_i,v_i+x/\log x]\subseteq(x,y]$,

$$\sum_{\substack{v<p\leqslant v+x/\log x\\ p\equiv 1\,(D)}} 1=\frac{x}{\phi(D)(\log x)^2}+O\biggl(\frac{y}{(\log y)^5}\biggr)\geqslant\frac{x}{(\log x)^3}+O\biggl(\frac{x}{(\log x)^4}\biggr).$$

As $K\leqslant\log x$, we see that if x is sufficiently large, then there are at least K primes $p\equiv 1\,(D)$ in $(v_i,v_i+x/\log x]$. If $q<q'$ are any two such primes, as

$q' - q \leqslant y$ and $q' \equiv q(D)$, any prime divisor p of $q' - q$ must either divide $D < 1 + \log x$ or be less than or equal to $y/D \leqslant x$. Hence $q' - q$ is x-smooth. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 6.2. Fix $\theta \in (0, 1]$ and a function $f_1 : [T_1, \infty) \to [x_1, \infty)$ of the first kind, and suppose Hypothesis 5.3 holds. In accordance with Theorem 5.4 (in which we take $a = 1$), let $K = K_\theta$ be a sufficiently large integer multiple of $\lceil (2/\theta) \rceil + 1$, let $A = A_K$ be sufficiently large and $\delta = \delta_\theta$ and $\eta = \eta(A, K)$ be sufficiently small.

In accordance with Corollary 4.2, let C be a sufficiently large but fixed positive constant and let x be a sufficiently large number. Suppose, as we may, that $Cx \geqslant x_1$, and (cf. Definition 5.1 (i)) set

$$N := (f_1^{-1}(Cx))^{1/\eta}.$$

Thus, $Cx = f_1(N^\eta)$ and N tends to infinity with x. Suppose x is large enough so that in accordance with Theorem 5.4, $N \geqslant N(T_1, K, \eta)$.

By Definition 5.1 (iv) there exists $L_\eta \geqslant 1$ such that $f_1(N)/x \to CL_\eta$ as $x \to \infty$. Fix nonnegative real numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\lceil (2/\theta) \rceil + 1}$ with $\alpha_1 \leqslant \dots \leqslant \alpha_{\lceil (2/\theta) \rceil + 1}$ and set

$$\beta_i := \alpha_i C L_\eta, \quad i \leqslant \lceil (2/\theta) \rceil + 1. \tag{6.5}$$

Fix a function $f_2 : [x_2, \infty) \to [z_2, \infty)$ of the second kind and consider the intervals

$$(x + \beta_i f_2(x), x + \beta_i f_2(x) + x/\log x], \quad i \leqslant \lceil (2/\theta) \rceil + 1. \tag{6.6}$$

Recall that $y := cx \log x \log_3 x / \log_2 x$, where $c > 0$ is a certain constant (cf. (4.1)). By Definition 6.1 (ii) we have $x/\log x = o(f_2(x))$ and $f_2(x) = o(y)$. Suppose, then, that x is large enough (in terms of $\beta_{\lceil (2/\theta) \rceil + 1}$) so that the intervals in (6.6) are all contained in $(x, y]$.

In accordance with Lemma 6.3, choose $\lceil (2/\theta) \rceil + 1$ pairwise disjoint sets of primes $\mathcal{H}_i$ of equal size, with

$$\mathcal{H}_i \subseteq (x + \beta_i f_2(x), x + \beta_i f_2(x) + x/\log x], \quad i \leqslant \lceil (2/\theta) \rceil + 1. \tag{6.7}$$

Thus, letting

$$\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{H}_{\lceil (2/\theta) \rceil + 1} =: \{q_1, \dots, q_K\},$$

we have that $\prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant K} (q_j - q_i)$ is x-smooth, and hence $f_1(N^\eta)$-smooth (we may suppose that $C \geqslant 1$).

As K is fixed we may of course suppose that $K \leqslant \log x$ and $p_K \leqslant x$, so that (4.7) is satisfied and $\mathcal{H}$, being a set of K primes larger than p_K, is admissible. We may of course also suppose that $y \leqslant N$, so that $\mathcal{H} \subseteq [0, N]$. Thus, $\mathcal{H}$ satisfies each of the hypotheses of Theorem 5.4.

Let $\mathcal{Z}(N^\eta)$ be as in Hypothesis 5.3, so that $\mathcal{Z}(N^\eta)$ is repulsive (cf. Definition 5.2), and note that since $x \leqslant f_1(N^\eta) \leqslant \log N^\eta$ (cf. Definition 5.1 (ii)),

$$\sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{Z}(N^\eta) \\ p \geqslant p'}} \frac{1}{p} \ll \frac{1}{p'} \ll \frac{1}{\log_2 N^\eta} \leqslant \frac{1}{\log f_1(N^\eta)} \leqslant \frac{1}{\log x}.$$

Thus, (4.10) is satisfied with $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}(N^\eta)$. Therefore, by Corollary 4.2 there exists a vector of residue classes $(c_p(p))_{p\leqslant f_1(N^\eta),\, p\notin \mathcal{Z}(N^\eta)}$ such that

$$\mathcal{H} = \big(\mathbb{Z}\cap(x,y]\big)\backslash\bigcup_{p\leqslant f_1(N^\eta),\, p\notin \mathcal{Z}(N^\eta)} c_p(p). \tag{6.8}$$

Let $b(W)$ be the arithmetic progression modulo

$$W := \prod_{\substack{p\leqslant f_1(N^\eta)\\ p\notin\mathcal{Z}(N^\eta)}} p$$

such that $b\equiv -c_p(p)$ for all primes $p\leqslant f_1(N^\eta)$ with $p\notin\mathcal{Z}(N^\eta)$. By (6.8) we have $(\prod_{i=1}^K(b+q_i),W)=1$.

Each hypothesis of Theorem 5.4 now accounted for, we conclude that there is some $n\in(N,2N]\cap b(W)$, and a pair of indices $i_1,i_2\in\{1,\dots,\lceil(2/\theta)\rceil+1\}$, $i_1<i_2$, such that

$$\#(\mathbf{P}\cap n+\mathcal{H}_{i_1})\geqslant 1 \quad\text{and}\quad \#(\mathbf{P}\cap n+\mathcal{H}_{i_2})\geqslant 1.$$

If there are more than two such indices, we take i_2-i_1 to be minimal.

Thus, if p is the largest prime in $\mathbf{P}\cap n+\mathcal{H}_{i_1}$ and p' is the smallest prime in $\mathbf{P}\cap n+\mathcal{H}_{i_2}$, then p and p' are *consecutive*, that is, $p=p_t$ and $p'=p_{t+1}$ for some t. Indeed, by (6.8) and the definition of $b(W)$, for any $n\equiv b(W)$ with $n+x\geqslant f_1(N^\eta)$ we have

$$\mathbf{P}\cap(n+x,n+y]=\mathbf{P}\cap n+\mathcal{H}.$$

By (6.7) and (6.5), and since $x/\log x=o(f_2(x))$, we have

$$p_{t+1}-p_t=(\beta_{i_2}-\beta_{i_1})f_2(x)+O\Big(\frac{x}{\log x}\Big)=(\alpha_{i_2}-\alpha_{i_1}+o(1))CL_\eta f_2(x).$$

Since there are only $O(1/\theta^2)$ distinct pairs of indices from which i_1 and i_2 may be chosen, we deduce that there exists a single pair $i_1<i_2$ such that, for arbitrarily large N, we have

$$p_{t+1}-p_t=(\alpha_{i_2}-\alpha_{i_1}+o(1))CL_\eta f_2(x),$$

for some pair of consecutive primes $p_t,p_{t+1}\in(N,N+y]\subseteq(N,3N]$.

Finally, using Definition 5.1 (i), (iii) and (iv) and Definition 6.1 (i) and (iii), we find that $CL_\eta f_2(x)\sim f_2(f_1(N))\sim f_2(f_1(3N))$. We conclude that

$$\frac{p_{t+1}-p_t}{f_2(f_1(p_t))}=(1+o(1))(\alpha_j-\alpha_i).$$

We deduce (6.2) and (6.3) by using the argument of [**1**, Corollary 1.2]. □

As in [**1**, Theorem 1.3], we may also consider "chains" of normalized, consecutive gaps between primes. Using essentially the same argument as above, but using (the unconditional) Theorem 4.3 (ii) of [**1**] in place of Theorem 5.4, one may verify the following result.

THEOREM 6.4. *Fix any integer a with $a\geqslant 2$. Fix functions $f_1:[T_1,\infty)\to[x_1,\infty)$ and $f_2:[x_1,\infty)\to[z_2,\infty)$ of the first and second kinds respectively, and let $f:=f_2\circ f_1$. Let $d_n:=p_{n+1}-p_n$, where p_n denotes the nth smallest prime, and let $\boldsymbol{L}_{a,f}$ denote the*

set of limit points in $[0,\infty]^a$ *of the sequence of "chains"*

$$\left(\tfrac{d_n}{f(p_n)},\dots,\tfrac{d_{n+a-1}}{f(p_{n+a-1})}\right)$$

for $p_n \geqslant T_1$. *Given* $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_K) \in \mathbb{R}^K$, *let* $S_a(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ *be the set*

$$\big\{\big(\alpha_{J(2)}-\alpha_{J(1)},\dots,\alpha_{J(a+1)}-\alpha_{J(a)}\big) : 1 \leqslant J(1) < \cdots < J(a+1) \leqslant K\big)\big\}.$$

For any $8a^2+16a$ *nonnegative real numbers* $\alpha_1 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \alpha_{8a^2+16a}$, *we have*

$$S_a(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \cap \boldsymbol{L}_f^a \neq \varnothing.$$

Let us call a function "reasonable" if it is of the form $f_2 \circ f_1$, where f_1 is a function of the first kind and f_2 is a function of the second kind. Theorem 6.4 shows that for any a there are infinitely many chains of consecutive prime gaps with $d_n,\dots,d_{n+a-1} > f(p_n)$ for any reasonable function f. There are reasonable functions f for which $f(T)/(R(T)\log_3 T)$ tends to 0 arbitrarily slowly (recall that $R(T) = \log T \log_2 T \log_4 T/(\log_3 T)^2$ is the Erdős–Rankin function). We believe that in a forthcoming paper [**5**], Ford, Maynard and Tao show that for any a there are infinitely many chains of consecutive prime gaps with $d_n,\dots,d_{n+a-1} \gg R(p_n)\log_3 p_n$.

References

[1] Banks, W. D., T. Freiberg and J. Maynard. "On limit points of the sequence of normalized prime gaps." Preprint (arXiv:1404.5094). 25pp., 2014.

[2] Davenport, H. *Multiplicative number theory.* 3rd edn. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 74. Springer–Verlag, New York, 2000. Revised and with a preface by H. L. Montgomery.

[3] Ford, K., B. Green, S. Konyagin and T. Tao. "Large gaps between consecutive prime numbers." Preprint (arXiv:1408.4505), 2014.

[4] Ford, K., B. Green, S. Konyagin, J. Maynard and T. Tao. "Long gaps between primes." Preprint. arXiv:1412.5029, 39pp., 2014

[5] Ford, K., J. Maynard and T. Tao. "Chains of large gaps between primes." Preprint.

[6] Goldston, D. A., J. Pintz and C. Y. Yildirim. "Primes in tuples I." *Ann. of Math.* (2) 170(2):819–862, 2009.

[7] Hildebrand, A. and H. Maier. "Gaps between prime numbers." *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 104(1):1–9, 1988.

[8] Maynard, J. "Small gaps between primes." *Ann. of Math.* (2). 181(1):383–413, 2015.

[9] Maynard, J. "Large gaps between primes." Preprint (arXiv:1408.5110), 2014.

[10] Pintz, J. "On the distribution of gaps between consecutive primes." Preprint (arXiv:1407.2213). 16pp., 2014.

[11] Pintz, J. "A note on the distribution of normalized prime gaps." Preprint (arXiv:1510.04577). 7pp., 2015.

[12] Soundararajan, K. "The distribution of prime numbers." pp.59–83 in: Granville, A. and Z. Rudnick (eds.). *Equidistribution in number theory, an introduction.* NATO Sci. Ser. II Math. Phys. Chem. 237. Springer, Dordrech, 2007.

[13] Westzynthius, E. "Über die Verteilung der Zahlen, die zu den n ersten Primzahlen teilerfremd sind." *Commentat. Phys.-Math.* 5(25):1–37, 1931.

Department of Mathematics, Brigham Young University, Provo UT, USA.
E-mail address: baker@math.byu.edu

Department of Pure Mathematics, University of Waterloo, Waterloo ON, CANADA.
E-mail address: tfreiberg@uwaterloo.ca